

1/21/72

Dear Jim,

Re: 17: I am and have been deeply immersed in the Latimer ploy, which provides opportunities for the application of some intellectual judo. When one is broke it takes more time and effort. It will, in the end, be one of their worst mistakes. I can't go into it now, and it keeps me at it pretty steady, to the detriment of other work that presses.

There is, as it turned out, nothing you could have done for me after you left. I had no way of knowing that then. I was more concerned with your family relations and your own later reactions, that's why I insisted on your going. And ask yourself was it not a compassionate thing that you wound up doing, elder-sitting for them and your folks?

If there were anything you could do in H.O. or Dallas, I'd ask, and will. I have written Louis for the pages I missed. If, in time, he doesn't provide them, I'll ask you to do it. Right now I don't have time to get the files out and give you the identifications. In Dallas, everything I did was on a basis of confidentiality, therefore none of it can be followed up by you, but I do appreciate the offer.

The same is true of the interviews not already transcribed. Everything on the trip is now filed except some notes I typed that I want to review before filing.

There is something you can do, however, because of your own conservative interests perhaps better than I, but if you do it I ask that you send me what you get and keep the whole thing confidential. Dr. John K. Latimer, Dept. Urology, Presbyterian Hospital, Columbia Univ., New York, wrote an article published in the New York State Journal of Medicine, 7/1/66 titled "Similarities in the Fatal Woundings of John Wilkes Booth and Lee Harvey Oswald". He twice refers to Oswald as a Communist enemy, and the word "enemy" is his. I'll give you quotes. "While both ~~xxx~~ shootings may well have been the actions of excited men in attacking what they considered to be a national enemy, there are many sophisticated observers who regard this point of view as being unduly naive. They believe that since both accused presidential assassins were active enemy sympathizers (Booth for the Confederacy and Oswald for the Communists), and since both shootings took place during an era of large-scale under-cover operations, psychological persuasions, philosophic rivalry, and intelligence activity, that both men may have been silenced as part of a larger design." And in a letter in Medical World News (copy marked), a similar right-wing perspective. I would like to know more about his politics, and that is an area of your familiarity. Right now he has had enough kickback to be shunning the press. He hasn't answered my more pointed letter. I think if you were to write him and express the belief, in the jargon you know, that these are areas needlessly left ambiguous at best by the Commission and solicit his opinion of why and note that he footnoted no source for those "sophisticated observers" and ask who they are as they relate to Ruby and Oswald, if he gives you anything it will be nut stuff. You might also seek his opinion of Ruby's politics, which he doesn't give, but he does use the inherently anti-Semitic "born Rubenstein". Use your own judgment on how far to go in pursuing an effort to get any anti-semitism from him. I think it might be dangerous, that he tries to sublimate it. And thanks for the try. Excuse rush, Best,